doji

Michael Bergknoff Computer Architect 3655 Caminito Carmel Landing San Diego. CA 92130

December 13, 2001

Judge Colleen Kollar-Kotelly United States District Court for the District of Columbia 333 Constitution Avenue, NW Washington, DC 20001

RE: US v. Microsoft proposed final order

Dear Judge Kollar-Kotelly.

I wish to add my voice to many others in disagreement with the proposed settlement. Rather than repeating the arguments you have assuredly read many times I will just point to one of the first commentaries I read that I was in agreement with. It was written by Ralph Nader and James Love on November 5, 2001. It is available at the web address http://www.cptech.org/at/ms/rnjl2kollarkotellynov501.html

In addition Nader's commentary I have a few additional items that I feel strongly about.

Any remedy seeking to prevent an extension of Microsoft's monopoly must place Microsoft products as extra-cost options in the purchase of new computers, so that the user who does not wish to purchase them is not forced to do so. This means that for the price differential between a new computer with Microsoft software and one without, a computer seller must offer the software without the computer (which would prevent computer makers from saying that the difference in price is only a few dollars). Only then could competition come to exist in a meaningful way.

The specifications of Microsoft's present and future document file formats must be made public. so that documents created in Microsoft applications may be read by programs from other makers, on Microsoft's or other operating systems. This is in addition to opening the Windows application program interface (API, the set of "hooks" that allow other parties to write applications for Windows operating systems), which is already part of the proposed settlement.

Any Microsoft networking protocols must be published in full and approved by an independent network protocol body. This would prevent Microsoft from seizing de facto control of the internet. Microsoft should not be allowed to dictate which parties have access to the specifications.

Sincerely.

Muld Bergh

Page 1